



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/762,941 | 01/22/2004 | Trevor J. Darrell | MIT-154PUS | 5964 |
| 22494 | 7590 | 02/04/2010 | | |
| DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP SUITE 301A 354A TURNPIKE STREET CANTON, MA 02021-2714 | | | EXAMINER MISLEH, JUSTIN P | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2622 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE 02/04/2010 | DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@dc-m.com
amk@dc-m.com

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/762,941 | Applicant(s) DARRELL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Justin P. Misleh | Art Unit 2622 | |

All Participants:

(1) Justin P. Misleh.

(2) Donald F. Moffard.

Status of Application: Non-Final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 January 2010

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

Independent Claims, generally

Prior art documents discussed:

Noda; Aarnio; and references on attached PTO-892

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The Examiner contacted Applicant's representative to discuss the invention, the present claims, the present office action, patentable features of the invention and the existing prior art. No specific agreements were reached

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Justin P Misleh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)